

REMARKS

The foregoing Amendment and these Remarks are in response to the Office Action dated July 18, 2005. Accordingly, this submission is accompanied by a request for a one-month extension of time, together with the required fee.

At the outset, Applicant and the undersigned wish to thank the Examiner for his time and thoughtful consideration of the issues during the telephone conference between the Examiner and the undersigned on October 13, 2005.

This will confirm that, during a telephone conversation between the Examiner and the undersigned on July 9, 2005, regarding a requirement for restriction, Applicant elected without traverse the group of claims 1 – 34 and 36 – 39. However, Applicant objects to the division of the claims into three groups, that is, claims 1- 34 and 36 – 39; claim 35; and claim 40. Applicant submits that claims 40, directed to an integrated circuit, and 35, directed to a method of testing an integrated circuit, are so closely related that they should be placed in a single group for a single divisional application.

In the Office Action dated July 18, 2005, claims 1 – 13, 18, 34, 36 and 37 were rejected as anticipated by Binkley et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,833,724. Claims 4 – 17, 19 – 33, 38 and 39 were objected to as being dependent from a dependent base claim. Claims 35 and 40 were withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Consequently, these claims have been cancelled. This response focuses on claims 1 and 36, from which all other claims still under consideration ultimately depend.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 36 to clarify the claimed invention. While Applicant believes the scope of these two claims has not changed as a result of the amendments, the amendment to claim 1 makes clear that the claimed method includes measuring “a plurality of power signals produced at a plurality of respective ordered connections” in response to an input signal, and identifying a defect in the integrated circuit “from a combination of two or more of the power signals” so measured. Similarly, the amendment to claim 36 makes clear that the claimed system acquires “a plurality of die power signal measurements from respective ordered connections” in response to transient input signals, and determines whether “a combination of two or more of the power signal measurements” indicates the presence of a defect in a die. As discussed with the Examiner during the aforementioned telephone conference regarding

the rejections, the point is that in Applicant's claimed method and system, the location of a defect can be determined because a plurality of power signal measurements from respective ordered connections are used to located a given defect.

In contrast, as also discussed with the Examiner, in the Binkley reference there is only one measurement taken at one power connection to determine the presence of a defect, so that the location of the defect cannot be determined.

During the telephone conference the Examiner expressed that he understood this distinction and that, based on this distinction Binkley does not anticipate, but indicted that a further search may be appropriate in response to this Amendment.

In view of the foregoing Amendments and Remarks, it is submitted that the claims 1 – 34 and 36 - 39 patentably distinguish over the prior art of record. Therefore, the Examiner is requested to enter the amendments, reconsider the rejections, and pass this case to issue.

As discussed with the Examiner, if the Examiner identifies another reference as a result of a further search that the Examiner considers more pertinent and that might give rise to a further rejection, the undersigned would greatly appreciate receiving a telephone call to discuss any such reference.

Respectfully submitted,

William A. Birdwell

William A. Birdwell
Reg. No. 27,181
Of Attorneys for Applicant
(503) 228-1841